



# Monte Vista Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2010–2011  
Glendale Unified School District



» An annual report to the community about teaching, learning, test results, resources, and measures of progress in our school.



Published by  
**SCHOOL WISE PRESS**

# Monte Vista Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2010–2011  
Glendale Unified School District

This School Accountability Report Card (SARC) provides information that can be used to evaluate and compare schools. State and federal laws require all schools to publish a SARC each year.

The information in this report represents the 2010–2011 school year, not the current school year. In most cases, this is the most recent data available. We present our school's results next to those of the average elementary school in the county and state to provide the most meaningful and fair comparisons. To find additional facts about our school online, please use the [DataQuest](#) tool offered by the California Department of Education.

Please note that words that appear in a smaller, bold typeface are links in the online version of this report to more information. You can find a list of those linked words and their Web page URLs at:

[http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links\\_2011\\_en.html](http://www.schoolwisepress.com/sarc/links_2011_en.html)

Reports about other schools are available on the [California Department of Education Web site](#). Internet access is available in local libraries.

If you have any questions related to this report, or would like to request a hardcopy version, please contact our school office.

## How to Contact Our School

2620 Orange Ave.  
La Crescenta, CA 91214  
Principal: Dr. Susan Hoge  
Phone: (818) 248-2617

## How to Contact Our District

223 North Jackson St.  
Glendale, CA 91206  
Phone: (818) 241-3111  
<http://gusd.net/>



## » Contents

ONLINE USERS: CLICK ON A TITLE TO JUMP TO THAT SECTION

[Principal's Message](#)  
[Measures of Progress](#)  
[Student Achievement](#)  
[Students](#)  
[Climate for Learning](#)  
[Leadership, Teachers, and Staff](#)  
[Adequacy of Key Resources 2011–2012](#)  
[Data Almanac](#)



Published by  
**SCHOOL WISE PRESS**  
385 Ashton Ave., Ste. 200  
San Francisco, CA 94112  
Phone: (415) 337-7971  
[www.schoolwisepress.com](http://www.schoolwisepress.com)

©2011 Publishing 20/20

# Monte Vista Elementary School

School Accountability Report Card, 2010–2011  
Glendale Unified School District



## » Principal's Message

Monte Vista Elementary School is a beautiful facility, nestled in the foothills of La Crescenta, and dedicated to excellence. The Monte Vista school community includes many, many actively involved and supportive parents and community members. There are high expectations for academic achievement, character, and behavior. Enrichment opportunities are routinely available. Monte Vista is an integral part of the community.

Monte Vista's excellence has been recognized with many awards over time. A National Blue Ribbon Award was earned in 2005. Previous to that time, state-level Distinguished School Awards were also presented to Monte Vista. Students and student teams frequently achieve award status in a variety of competitions. Our Robotics Team consists of enthusiastic programmers who successfully compete, at district elementary competitions.

Dr. Susan Hoge, PRINCIPAL

### Grade range and calendar

**K-6**

TRADITIONAL

### Academic Performance Index

**939**

County Average: 802  
State Average: 807

### Student enrollment

**585**

County Average: 608  
State Average: 534

### Teachers

**22**

### Students per teacher

**27**

## School Expenditures

A combination of state and federal funding is used to cover all aspects of our instructional program. The school site council provides annual guidance for this funding. Combined funding with our foundation, supports personnel for our library and media (computer) center. Strong PTA and school foundation support is also evident in many of our schools' supplemental activities. Grants and funds for specific purposes are also utilized. Monte Vista has an extensive variety of enrichment and GATE programs. Gifted And Talented Education students receive differentiated instruction in the classroom. In addition, there is an array of GATE after school classes throughout the year. Classes have included topics such as human body/science, tangrams/math, and robotics. Math Club meets during lunchtime for a portion of the year.

## Safety

Safety of students and staff is a primary concern of Monte Vista Elementary School. Parent volunteers, noon yard supervisors, teachers, and our administrators supervise students at breaks, lunch, and before and after school. All visitors to campus must report to the front office, sign in, and obtain a visitor's pass which must be displayed at all times.

Safety information, rules, procedures, etc. are disseminated to students, parents and staff members in a variety of ways and formats including a district behavior packet, school rules and information as primary packets or in upper grade agendas, PTA handbook, assemblies, parent meetings, automated phone messages, our weekly newsletter, and our Web site postings.

The School Safety Plan is evaluated and revised annually by members of the Site Safety Committee and then shared with staff and the School Site Council. The Emergency Plan is also updated annually and emergency supplies checked. The PTA has strengthened this process by helping to inventory emergency bin items. PTA funds, district resources, and donations filled in needed items. Our PTA also sells individual emergency kits at cost in the fall.

The school is always in compliance with the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and state earthquake standards. Fire and earthquake drills are conducted on a regular basis throughout the school year.

## Buildings

Originally constructed in 1948, Monte Vista Elementary is situated on 7.09 acres and has 24 classrooms, a library/media/computer center, a cafeteria, a lunch shelter, grassy fields, a blacktop playground, and administrative offices. Measure K funding made it possible for Monte Vista Elementary to add accessible paths of travel throughout the campus, and to renovate all restrooms, classrooms, administrative areas, and the library/computer lab. In the fall of 2010 backpack racks were installed outside of classrooms, funded by our PTA and Foundation. The buildings and campus are part of the excellence that is Monte Vista. Beautiful plantings and a small park add to the welcoming atmosphere.

## Parent Involvement

Parents, relatives, and community members form a strong volunteer corps organized by our PTA. Over 1,000 volunteer hours are logged in each month. Volunteers assist in classrooms, provide one-on-one tutoring, drive and/or accompany students on field trips, read aloud to classes, and prepare classroom materials. Volunteers bring many skills and abilities to Monte Vista. Each June our school staff organizes an elaborate volunteer breakfast to honor our many volunteers.

The Monte Vista PTA is a large, active organization. Regular association, board, and committee meetings are held throughout the year. Another major site organization is our Foundation. This group of parents and staff fund-raise to benefit the students and enhance the overall school program. There is a major fall campaign and several smaller fund-raisers scheduled during the year. Typically, about \$50,000 is raised during the year. Annual grants provide for increased staff for our media center and library, a musical theater program, living history assemblies, a primary music program, and assistance with the costs of a technology conference.

See [www.montevistaca.com](http://www.montevistaca.com) for more information about PTA and Foundation.

**MEASURES OF PROGRESS**

**Academic Performance Index**

The Academic Performance Index (API) is California’s way of comparing schools based on student test scores. The index was created in 1999 to help parents and educators recognize schools that show progress and identify schools that need help. It is also used to compare schools in a statewide ranking system. The California Department of Education (CDE) calculates a school’s API using student test results from the California Standards Tests and, for high schools, the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE). APIs range from 200 to 1000. The CDE expects all schools to eventually obtain APIs of at least 800. [Additional information on the API](#) can be found on the CDE Web site.

Monte Vista’s API was 939 (out of 1000). This is a decline of 2 points compared with last year’s API. All students took the test. You can find three years of detailed API results in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

**API RANKINGS:** Based on our 2009–2010 test results, we started the 2010–2011 school year with a base API of 941. The state ranks all schools according to this score on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 being highest). Compared with all elementary schools in California, our school ranked 10 out of 10.

**SIMILAR SCHOOL RANKINGS:** We also received a second ranking that compared us with the 100 schools with the most similar students, teachers, and class sizes. Compared with these schools, our school ranked 7 out of 10. The CDE recalculates this factor every year. To read more about the specific elements included in this calculation, refer to the [CDE Web site](#).

**API GROWTH TARGETS:** Each year the CDE sets specific API “growth targets” for every school. It assigns one growth target for the entire school, and it sets additional targets for ethnic groups, English Learners, special education students, or socioeconomic subgroups of students that make up a significant portion of the student body. Schools are required to meet all of their growth targets. If they do, they may be eligible to apply for awards through the California School Recognition Program and the Title I Achieving Schools Program.


We met our assigned growth targets during the 2010–2011 school year. Just for reference, 64 percent of elementary schools statewide met their growth targets.

CALIFORNIA <b>API</b> ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX	
<b>Met schoolwide growth target</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met growth target for prior school year</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>API score</b>	<b>939</b>
<b>Growth attained from prior year</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Met subgroup* growth targets</b>	<b>Yes</b>

SOURCE: API based on spring 2011 test cycle. Growth scores alone are displayed and are current as of November 2011.

\*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school’s student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals.  
R/P - Results pending due to challenge by school.  
N/A - Results not available.

**API, Spring 2011**



SOURCE: API based on spring 2011 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only.  
NOTE: Only groups of students that represent at least 15 percent of total enrollment are calculated and displayed as student subgroups.

### Adequate Yearly Progress

In addition to California’s accountability system, which measures student achievement using the API, schools must also meet requirements set by the federal education law known as **No Child Left Behind** (NCLB). This law requires all schools to meet a different goal: **Adequate Yearly Progress** (AYP).

We met all 17 criteria for yearly progress. As a result, we succeeded at making AYP.

To meet AYP, elementary schools must meet three criteria. First, a certain percentage of students must score at or above Proficient levels on the California Standards Tests (CST), the California Modified Assessment (CMA), and the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA): 67.6 percent on the English/language arts test and 68.5 percent on the math test. All ethnic, English Learners, special education, and socioeconomic subgroups of students also must meet these goals. Second, the schools must achieve an API of at least 710 or increase the API by one point from the prior year. Third, 95 percent of the student body must take the required standardized tests.

If even one subgroup of students fails to meet just one of the criteria, the school fails to meet AYP. While all schools must report their progress toward meeting AYP, only schools that receive federal funding to help economically disadvantaged students are actually penalized if they fail to meet AYP goals. Schools that do not make AYP for two or more years in a row in the same subject enter **Program Improvement** (PI). They must offer students transfers to other schools in the district and, in their second year in PI, tutoring services as well.

FEDERAL <b>AYP</b> ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS	
<b>Met AYP</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met schoolwide participation rate</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met schoolwide test score goals</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met subgroup* participation rate</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met subgroup* test score goals</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Met schoolwide API for AYP</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Program Improvement school in 2011</b>	<b>No</b>

SOURCE: AYP is based on the Accountability Progress Report of November 2011. A school can be in Program Improvement based on students’ test results in the 2010–2011 school year or earlier.

\*Ethnic groups, English Learners, special ed students, or socioeconomic groups of students that make up 15 percent or more of a school’s student body. These groups must meet AYP and API goals. *R/P* - Results pending due to challenge by school. *N/A* - Results not available.

### Adequate Yearly Progress, Detail by Subgroup

● MET GOAL ● DID NOT MEET GOAL — NOT ENOUGH STUDENTS

	English/Language Arts		Math	
	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 67.6% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?	DID 95% OF STUDENTS TAKE THE CST, CMA OR CAPA?	DID 68.5% OF STUDENTS SCORE PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED ON THE CST, CMA, & CAPA?
<b>SCHOOLWIDE RESULTS</b>	●	●	●	●
<b>SUBGROUPS OF STUDENTS</b>				
<b>Students learning English</b>	●	●	●	●
<b>STUDENTS BY ETHNICITY</b>				
<b>Asian American</b>	●	●	●	●
<b>White/Other</b>	●	●	●	●

SOURCE: AYP release of November 2011, CDE.

The table at left shows our success or failure in meeting AYP goals in the 2010–2011 school year. The green dots represent goals we met; red dots indicate goals we missed. Just one red dot means that we failed to meet AYP.

Note: Dashes indicate that too few students were in the category to draw meaningful conclusions. Federal law requires valid test scores from at least 50 students for statistical significance.


## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Here you'll find a three-year summary of our students' scores on the California Standards Tests (CST) in selected subjects. We compare our students' test scores with the results for students in the average elementary school in California. On the following pages we provide more detail for each test, including the scores for different subgroups of students. In addition, we provide links to the California Content Standards on which these tests are based. If you'd like more information about the CST, please contact our principal or our teaching staff. To find [grade-level-specific scores](#), you can refer to the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Web site. Other tests in the [STAR program](#) can be found on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site.

### California Standards Tests

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

■ FAR BELOW BASIC ■ BELOW BASIC ■ BASIC ■ PROFICIENT ■ ADVANCED



SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 test cycle. State average represents elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.

## Frequently Asked Questions About Standardized Tests

**WHERE CAN I FIND GRADE-LEVEL REPORTS?** Due to space constraints and concern for statistical reliability, we have omitted grade-level detail from these test results. Instead we present results at the schoolwide level. You can view the results of far more students than any one grade level would contain, which also improves their statistical reliability. Grade-level results are online on the [STAR Web site](#). More information about student test scores is available in the Data Almanac that accompanies this report.

**WHAT DO THE FIVE PROFICIENCY BANDS MEAN?** Test experts assign students to one of these five proficiency levels, based on the number of questions they answer correctly. Our immediate goal is to help students move up one level. Our eventual goal is to enable all students to reach either of the top two bands, Advanced or Proficient. Those who score in the middle band, Basic, have come close to attaining the required knowledge and skills. Those who score in either of the bottom two bands, Below Basic or Far Below Basic, need more help to reach the Proficient level.

**HOW HARD ARE THE CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS?** Experts consider California's standards to be among the most clear and rigorous in the country. Just 56 percent of elementary school students scored Proficient or Advanced on the English/language arts test; 62 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in math. You can review the [California Content Standards](#) on the CDE Web site.

**ARE ALL STUDENTS' SCORES INCLUDED?** No. Only students in grades two through eleven are required to take the CST. When fewer than 11 students in one grade or subgroup take a test, state officials remove their scores from the report. They omit them to protect students' privacy, as called for by federal law.

**CAN I REVIEW SAMPLE TEST QUESTIONS?** Sample test questions for the CST are on the [CDE's Web site](#). These are actual questions used in previous years.

**WHERE CAN I FIND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION?** The CDE has a wealth of resources on its Web site. The STAR Web site publishes detailed reports for schools and districts, and assistance packets for parents and teachers. This site includes explanations of [technical terms](#), scoring methods, and the [subjects](#) covered by the tests for each grade. You'll also find a [guide](#) to navigating the STAR Web site as well as help for understanding how to [compare test scores](#).



**English/Language Arts (Reading and Writing)**

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

**FAR BELOW BASIC** **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			86%	96%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About 30 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			54%	95%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			56%	95%	

**Subgroup Test Scores**

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):


**FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC** **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>Boys</b>			82%	211	<b>GENDER:</b> About seven percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			89%	208	
<b>English proficient</b>			90%	347	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> English Learners scored lower on the CST than students who are proficient in English. Because we give this test in English, English Learners tend to be at a disadvantage.
<b>English Learners</b>			76%	71	
<b>Low income</b>			82%	37	<b>INCOME:</b> About four percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
<b>Not low income</b>			86%	379	
<b>Learning disabled</b>	DATA STATISTICALLY UNRELIABLE		N/S	27	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			87%	392	
<b>Asian American</b>			88%	155	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			86%	33	
<b>White/Other</b>			83%	213	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our students’ scores have changed over the years. We present each year’s results in a vertical bar, with students’ scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

You can read the California standards for [English/language arts](#) on the CDE’s Web site.



**Math**

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

**FAR BELOW BASIC** **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			87%	97%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About 25 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			60%	89%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			62%	90%	

**Subgroup Test Scores**

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):


**FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC** **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>Boys</b>			86%	215	<b>GENDER:</b> About two percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			88%	208	
<b>English proficient</b>			88%	351	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> English Learners scored about the same on this test as did students who are proficient in English. Because we give this test in English, English Learners tend to be at a disadvantage.
<b>English Learners</b>			89%	71	
<b>Low income</b>			64%	38	<b>INCOME:</b> About 23 percent fewer students from lower-income families scored Proficient or Advanced than our other students.
<b>Not low income</b>			87%	382	
<b>Learning disabled</b>			85%	30	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> Students classified as learning disabled scored lower than students without learning disabilities. The CST is not designed to test the progress of students with moderate to severe learning differences.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			88%	392	
<b>Asian American</b>			95%	155	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>			57%	34	
<b>White/Other</b>			84%	216	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 N/S: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our students' scores have changed over the years. We present each year's results in a vertical bar, with students' scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

You can read the [math standards](#) on the CDE's Web site.



SOURCE: CDE STAR research file: 2009, 2010, and 2011.

**Science**

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW THESE PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):

**FAR BELOW BASIC** **BELOW BASIC** **BASIC** **PROFICIENT** **ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE</b>			94%	96%	<b>SCHOOLWIDE AVERAGE:</b> About 37 percent more students at our school scored Proficient or Advanced than at the average elementary school in California.
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE COUNTY</b>			55%	94%	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA</b>			57%	94%	

**Subgroup Test Scores**

BAR GRAPHS BELOW SHOW TWO PROFICIENCY GROUPS (LEFT TO RIGHT):


**FAR BELOW BASIC, BELOW BASIC, AND BASIC** **PROFICIENT AND ADVANCED**

GROUP	LOW SCORES	HIGH SCORES	PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED	STUDENTS TESTED	COMMENTS
<b>Boys</b>			92%	39	<b>GENDER:</b> About three percent more girls than boys at our school scored Proficient or Advanced.
<b>Girls</b>			95%	42	
<b>English proficient</b>			97%	70	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of English Learners tested was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
<b>English Learners</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	10	
<b>Low income</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	6	<b>INCOME:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested from low-income families was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Not low income</b>			93%	75	
<b>Learning disabled</b>	NO DATA AVAILABLE		N/A	3	<b>LEARNING DISABILITIES:</b> We cannot compare scores for these two subgroups because the number of students tested with learning disabilities was either zero or too small to be statistically significant.
<b>Not learning disabled</b>			94%	78	
<b>Asian American</b>			90%	30	<b>ETHNICITY:</b> Test scores are likely to vary among students of different ethnic origins. The degree of variance will differ from school to school. Measures of the achievement gap are beyond the scope of this report.
<b>White/Other</b>			95%	44	

SOURCE: The scores for the CST are from the spring 2011 test cycle. County and state averages represent elementary schools only. Whenever a school reports fewer than 11 scores for a particular subgroup at any grade level, the CDE suppresses the scores when it releases the data to the public. Missing data makes it impossible for us to compile complete schoolwide results. Therefore, the results published in this report may vary from other published CDE test scores.  
 N/A: Not applicable. Either no students took the test, or to safeguard student privacy the CDE withheld all results because very few students took the test in any grade.  
 NS: Not statistically significant. While we have some data to report, we are suppressing it because the number of valid test scores is not large enough to be meaningful.

The graph to the right shows how our students’ scores have changed over the years. We present each year’s results in a vertical bar, with students’ scores arrayed across five proficiency bands. When viewing schoolwide results over time, remember that **progress** can take many forms. It can be more students scoring in the top proficiency bands (blue); it can also be fewer students scoring in the lower two proficiency bands (brown and red).

The science standards test was administered only to fifth graders. Of course, students in all grade levels study science in these areas: physical science, life science, earth science, and investigation and experimentation. For background, you can review the [science standards](#) by going to the CDE’s Web site.



**STUDENTS**

**Students’ English Language Skills**

At Monte Vista, 85 percent of students were considered to be proficient in English, compared with 77 percent of elementary school students in California overall.

LANGUAGE SKILLS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
English-proficient students	85%	87%	77%
English Learners	15%	13%	23%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2010–2011. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

**Languages Spoken at Home by English Learners, 2010–2011**

Please note that this table describes the home languages of just the 90 students classified as English Learners. At Monte Vista, the language these students most often speak at home is Korean. In California it’s common to find English Learners in classes with students who speak English well. When you visit our classrooms, ask our teachers how they work with language differences among their students.

LANGUAGE	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Spanish	3%	81%	82%
Vietnamese	0%	2%	3%
Cantonese	0%	3%	2%
Hmong	0%	0%	1%
Filipino/Tagalog	4%	1%	2%
Korean	72%	2%	1%
Khmer/Cambodian	0%	1%	0%
All other	21%	10%	9%

SOURCE: Language Census for school year 2010–2011. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

**Ethnicity**

Most students at Monte Vista identify themselves as White or Asian/Pacific Islander. The state of California allows citizens to choose more than one ethnic identity, or to select “two or more races” or “decline to state.” As a consequence, the sum of all responses rarely equals 100 percent.

ETHNICITY	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
African American	1%	9%	6%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	39%	10%	11%
Hispanic/Latino	9%	64%	53%
White	50%	14%	26%

SOURCE: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), October 2010. County and state averages represent elementary schools only.

**Family Income and Education**

The **free or reduced-price meal** subsidy goes to students whose families earned less than \$40,793 a year (based on a family of four) in the 2010–2011 school year. At Monte Vista, eight percent of the students qualified for this program, compared with 60 percent of students in California.

FAMILY FACTORS	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Low-income indicator	8%	69%	60%
Parents with some college	86%	49%	56%
Parents with college degree	76%	28%	32%

SOURCE: The free and reduced-price lunch information is gathered by most districts in October. This data is from the 2010–2011 school year. Parents’ education level is collected in the spring at the start of testing. Rarely do all students answer these questions.

The parents of 86 percent of the students at Monte Vista have attended college and 76 percent have a college degree. This information can provide some clues to the level of literacy children bring to school. One precaution is that the students themselves provide this data when they take the battery of standardized tests each spring, so it may not be completely accurate. About 62 percent of our students provided this information.

**CLIMATE FOR LEARNING**

**Average Class Sizes**

Because funding for class-size reduction was focused on the early grade levels, our school’s class sizes, like those of most elementary schools, differ across grade levels.

The average class size at Monte Vista varies across grade levels from a low of 21 students to a high of 35. Our average class size schoolwide is 26 students.

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY GRADE	OUR SCHOOL
Kindergarten	21
First grade	23
Second grade	24
Third grade	24
Fourth grade	35
Fifth grade	32
Sixth grade	34

SOURCE: California Department of Education, SARC Research File. State and county averages represent elementary schools only.

**LEADERSHIP, TEACHERS, AND STAFF**

**Indicators of Teachers Who May Be Underprepared**

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	OUR SCHOOL	COUNTY AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Core courses taught by a teacher not meeting NCLB standards</b>	Percentage of core courses not taught by a “highly qualified” teacher according to federal standards in NCLB	0%	N/A	0%
<b>Fully credentialed teachers</b>	Percentage of staff holding a full, clear authorization to teach at the elementary or secondary level	92%	N/A	N/A
<b>Teachers lacking a full credential</b>	Percentage of teachers without a full, clear credential	8%	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Data on NCLB standards is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file. Information on teachers lacking a full credential provided by the school district.

PLEASE NOTE: Comparative data (county average and state averages) for some of the data reported in the SARC is unavailable.

**“HIGHLY QUALIFIED” TEACHERS:** The federal law known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires districts to report the number of teachers considered to be “highly qualified.” These “highly qualified” teachers must have a full credential, a bachelor’s degree, and, if they are teaching a core subject (such as reading, math, science, or social studies), they must also demonstrate expertise in that field. The table above shows the percentage of core courses taught by teachers who are considered to be less than “highly qualified.” There are exceptions, known as the **High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE)** rules, that allow some veteran teachers to meet the “highly qualified” test who wouldn’t otherwise do so.

**CREDENTIAL STATUS OF TEACHERS:** Teachers who lack full credentials are working under the terms of an emergency permit, an internship credential, or a waiver. They should be working toward their credential, and they are allowed to teach in the meantime only if the school board approves. About eight percent of our teachers were working without full credentials.

### Districtwide Distribution of Teachers Who Are Not “Highly Qualified”

Here, we report the percentage of core courses in our district whose teachers are considered to be less than “highly qualified” by NCLB’s standards. We show how these teachers are distributed among schools according to the percentage of low-income students enrolled.

When more than 40 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is considered by the California Department of Education to be a school with higher concentrations of low-income students. About 70 percent of the state’s schools are in this category. When less than 25 percent of the students in a school are receiving subsidized lunches, that school is considered by the CDE to be a school with lower concentrations of low-income students. About 19 percent of the state’s schools are in this category.

DISTRICT FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	CORE COURSES NOT TAUGHT BY HQT IN DISTRICT
<b>Districtwide</b>	Percentage of core courses not taught by “highly qualified” teachers (HQT)	6%
<b>Schools with more than 40% of students from lower-income homes</b>	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	7%
<b>Schools with less than 25% of students from lower-income homes</b>	Schools whose core courses are not taught by “highly qualified” teachers	5%

SOURCE: Data is from the California Department of Education, SARC research file.

**Specialized Resource Staff**

The table to the right lists the number of full-time equivalent qualified support personnel who provide counseling and other pupil support services in our school. These specialists often work part time at our school and some may work at more than one school in our district. For more details on [statewide ratios of counselors, psychologists, or other pupil services](#) staff to students, see the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site. [Library facts](#) and frequently asked questions are also available there.

STAFF POSITION	STAFF (FTE)
Academic counselors	0.0
Behavioral/career counselors	0.0
Librarians and media staff	0.0
Psychologists	0.0
Social workers	0.0
Nurses	0.0
Speech/language/hearing specialists	0.0
Resource specialists	0.0

SOURCE: Data provided by the school district.

**TECHNICAL NOTE ON DATA RECENCY:** All data is the most current available as of November 2011. The CDE may release additional or revised data for the 2010–2011 school year after the publication date of this report. We rely on the following sources of information from the California Department of Education: California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) (October 2010); Language Census (March 2011); California Standards Tests (spring 2011 test cycle); Academic Performance Index (November 2011 growth score release); Adequate Yearly Progress (November 2011).

**DISCLAIMER:** School Wise Press, the publisher of this accountability report, makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of this information but offers no guarantee, express or implied. While we do our utmost to ensure the information is complete, we must note that we are not responsible for any errors or omissions in the data. Nor are we responsible for any damages caused by the use of the information this report contains. Before you make decisions based on this information, we strongly recommend that you visit the school and ask the principal to provide the most up-to-date facts available.

rev20120112\_19-64568-6013783e/16382



## » Adequacy of Key Resources 2011–2012

Here you'll find key facts about our teachers, textbooks, and facilities during the school year in progress, 2011–2012. Please note that these facts are based on evaluations our staff conducted in accordance with the Williams legislation.

This section also contains information about 2010–2011 staff development days, and, for high schools, percentages of seniors who met our district's graduation requirements.



**TEACHERS**

Teacher Vacancies

KEY FACTOR	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
<b>TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR</b>			
Total number of classes at the start of the year	23	23	23
Number of classes that lacked a permanently assigned teacher within the first 20 days of school	0	0	0
<b>TEACHER VACANCIES OCCURRING DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR</b>			
Number of classes where the permanently assigned teacher left during the year	1	0	0
Number of those classes where you replaced the absent teacher with a single new teacher	1	0	0

**NOTES:**

There are two general circumstances that can lead to the unfortunate case of a classroom without a full-time, permanently assigned teacher. Within the first 20 days of the start of school, we can be surprised by too many students showing up for school or too few teachers showing up to teach. After school starts, however, teachers can also be surprised by sudden changes: family emergencies, injuries, accidents, etc. When that occurs, it is our school’s and our district’s responsibility to fill that teacher’s vacancy with a qualified, full-time, and permanently assigned replacement. For that reason, we report teacher vacancies in two parts: at the start of school and after the start of school.

### Teacher Misassignments

A “misassigned” teacher is one who lacks the appropriate subject-area authorization for a class she is teaching. Under the terms of the Williams settlement, schools must inform the public of the number of their teachers who are misassigned. It is possible for a teacher who lacks the authorization for a subject to get special permission—in the form of an emergency permit, waiver, or internship authorization—from the school board or county office of education to teach the subject anyway. This permission prevents the teacher from being counted as misassigned.

KEY FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	2009–2010	2010–2011	2011–2012
<b>Teacher Misassignments</b>	Total number of classes taught by teachers without a legally recognized certificate or credential	0	0	0
<b>Teacher Misassignments in Classes that Include English Learners</b>	Total number of classes that include English Learners and are taught by teachers without CLAD/BCLAD authorization, ELD or SDAIE training, or equivalent authorization from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing	3	0	0
<b>Other Employee Misassignments</b>	Total number of service area placements of employees without the required credentials	0	0	0

**NOTES:**

### Staff Development

Teachers take some time each year to improve their teaching skills and to extend their knowledge of the subjects they teach. Here you’ll see the amount of time we set aside for the past three years for their continuing education and professional development.

YEAR	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAYS
<b>2010–2011</b>	3.00
<b>2009–2010</b>	3.00
<b>2008–2009</b>	3.00

**TEXTBOOKS**

The main fact about textbooks that the Williams legislation calls for described whether schools have enough books in core classes for all students. The law also asks districts to reveal whether those books are presenting what the California Content Standards call for.

All of our textbooks except for those in the following subject areas are the most recently approved by the State Board of Education or our Local Governing Agency:

This information was collected on 11/9/10.

**NOTES:**

TAUGHT AT OUR SCHOOL?	SUBJECT	ARE THERE TEXTBOOKS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN USE?		ARE THERE ENOUGH BOOKS FOR EACH STUDENT?	
		STANDARDS ALIGNED?	OFFICIALLY ADOPTED?	FOR USE IN CLASS?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING BOOKS TO TAKE HOME?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>English</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Math</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Science</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Social Science</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Foreign Languages</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Health</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Visual/Performing Arts</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### Textbooks in Use

Here are some of the textbooks we use for our core courses.

SUBJECT AND TITLE	PUBLISHER	YEAR ADOPTED
ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS		
Reading - California	Houghton Mifflin	2003
The Language of Literature	McDougal Littell	2003
MATH		
Everyday Mathematics	McMillan McGraw-Hill	2009
SCIENCE		
California Science	MacMillan McGraw-Hill	2007
California Earth Science	Prentice Hall	2007
SOCIAL SCIENCE		
Reflections: California Series	Harcourt	2006
California Vistas	McMillan McGraw-Hill	2006
World History: Ancient Civilizations	McDougal Littell	2006

**FACILITIES**

To determine the condition of our facilities, our district sent experts from our facilities team to perform an inspection using a survey called the Facilities Inspection Tool, which is issued by the Office of Public School Construction.

Based on that survey, we’ve answered the questions you see on this report. Please note that the information reflects the condition of our buildings as of the date of the report. Since that time, those conditions may have changed.

**INSPECTORS AND ADVISORS:** This report was completed on 03/08/2011 by Luie Hernandez. The most recent facilities inspection occurred on 12/10/2010.

**ADDITIONAL INSPECTORS:** There were no other inspectors used in the completion of this form.

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	No apparent problems
<b>A. Systems</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Gas</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Mechanical/HVAC</b>		No apparent problems
<b>3. Sewer</b>		No apparent problems
<b>B. Interior Surfaces</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Interior Surfaces</b>		No apparent problems
<b>C. Cleanliness</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Overall cleanliness</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Pest/Vermin</b>		No apparent problems
<b>D. Electrical Components</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Electrical Components</b>		No apparent problems
<b>E. Rest Rooms/Fountains</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Rest Rooms</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Drinking Fountains</b>		No apparent problems
<b>F. Safety</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Fire Safety</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Hazardous Materials</b>		No apparent problems

AREA	RATING	REPAIR NEEDED AND ACTION TAKEN OR PLANNED
<b>G. Structural</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Structural Damage</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Roofs/Gutters</b>		No apparent problems
<b>H. External</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>1. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences</b>		No apparent problems
<b>2. Playgrounds/School Grounds</b>		No apparent problems

**SCHOOL FINANCES, 2009–2010**

We are required by the California Dept. of Education to report financial data from the 2009–2010 school year. More recent financial data is available on request from the district office.

**Spending per Student**

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we first report our overall spending per student. We base our calculations on our average daily attendance (ADA).

We’ve broken down expenditures by the type of funds used to pay for them. Unrestricted funds can be used for any lawful purpose. Restricted funds, however, must be spent for specific purposes set out by legal requirements or the donor. Examples include funding for instructional materials, economic impact aid, and teacher and principal training funds.

Next to the figures for the district and state averages, we show the percentage by which the school’s spending varies from the district and state averages. For example, we calculate the school’s variance from the district average using this formula:

$$\frac{(\text{SCHOOL AMOUNT} - \text{DISTRICT AVERAGE})}{\text{DISTRICT AVERAGE}}$$

TYPE OF FUNDS	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
<b>Unrestricted funds (\$/student)</b>	\$4,530	\$4,059	12%	\$5,513	-18%
<b>Restricted funds (\$/student)</b>	\$1,119	\$1,684	-34%	\$2,939	-62%
<b>Total (\$/student)</b>	\$5,649	\$5,744	-2%	\$8,452	-33%

**Compensation for Staff with Teaching Credentials**

To make comparisons possible across schools and districts of varying sizes, we report our compensation per full-time equivalent (FTE) certificated staff.\* A teacher/administrator/pupil services person who works full-time counts as 1.0 FTE. Those who work only half time count as 0.5 FTE.

CERTIFICATED STAFF*	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-DISTRICT VARIANCE	STATE AVERAGE	SCHOOL-TO-STATE VARIANCE
<b>Salary (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$72,806	\$73,624	-1%	\$71,246	2%
<b>Benefits (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$24,815	\$22,954	8%	\$16,062	54%
<b>Total (\$/certificated staff)</b>	\$97,622	\$96,578	1%	\$87,308	12%

\* A certificated staff person is a school employee who is required by the state to hold teaching credentials, including full-time, part-time, substitute, or temporary teachers and most administrators.



## » Data Almanac

This Data Almanac provides additional information about students, teachers, student performance, accountability, and district expenditures.



**STUDENTS AND TEACHERS**

**Student Enrollment by Ethnicity and Other Characteristics**

The ethnicity of our students, estimates of their family income and education level, their English fluency, and their learning-related disabilities.

GROUP	ENROLLMENT
Number of students	585
Black/African American	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%
Asian	36%
Filipino	3%
Hispanic or Latino	9%
Pacific Islander	0%
White (not Hispanic)	50%
Two or more races	2%
Ethnicity not reported	0%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	9%
English Learners	28%
Students with disabilities	7%

SOURCE: All but the last three lines are from the annual census, CALPADS, October 2010. Data about students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, English Learners, or learning disabled come from the School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

**Student Enrollment by Grade Level**

Number of students enrolled in each grade level at our school.

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS
Kindergarten	86
Grade 1	77
Grade 2	66
Grade 3	86
Grade 4	89
Grade 5	80
Grade 6	101
Grade 7	0
Grade 8	0
Grade 9	0
Grade 10	0
Grade 11	0
Grade 12	0

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2010.

**Average Class Size by Grade Level**

GRADE LEVEL	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
Kindergarten	20	18	21
Grade 1	19	20	23
Grade 2	20	21	24
Grade 3	20	21	24
Grade 4	36	33	35
Grade 5	35	35	32
Grade 6	36	33	34
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined K–3	N/A	17	N/A
Combined 3–4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	34	35	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2010. Information for 2009-2010 provided by the school district.

**Average Class Size by Grade Level, Detail**

The number of classrooms that fall into each range of class sizes.

GRADE LEVEL	2008–2009			2009–2010			2010–2011		
	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+	1–20	21–32	33+
Kindergarten	3	0	0	3	0	0	2	3	0
Grade 1	4	0	0	1	2	0	2	2	0
Grade 2	4	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0
Grade 3	4	0	0	1	3	0	0	4	0
Grade 4	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	3
Grade 5	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	0
Grade 6	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	3
Combined K–3	0	0	0	1	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 3–4	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Combined 4–8	0	0	1	0	0	2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: CALPADS, October 2010. Information for 2009-2010 provided by the school district.

### Teacher Credentials

The number of teachers assigned to the school with a full credential and without a full credential, for both our school and the district.

TEACHERS	SCHOOL			DISTRICT
	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011	2010–2011
<b>With Full Credential</b>	24	27	N/A	N/A
<b>Without Full Credential</b>	0	0	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Information provided by school district.

### Physical Fitness

Students in grades five, seven, and nine take the California Fitness Test each year. This test measures students’ aerobic capacity, body composition, muscular strength, endurance, and flexibility using six different tests. The table shows the percentage of students at our school who scored within the “healthy fitness zone” on four, five, and all six tests. More information about [physical fitness testing and standards](#) is available on the CDE Web site.

GRADE LEVEL	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING HEALTHY FITNESS ZONES		
	FOUR OF SIX STANDARDS	FIVE OF SIX STANDARDS	SIX OF SIX STANDARDS
<b>Grade 5</b>	12%	23%	52%
<b>Grade 7</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Grade 9</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Physical fitness test data is produced annually as schools test their students on the six Fitnessgram Standards. This information is from the 2010–2011 school year.

### Suspensions and Expulsions

At times we find it necessary to suspend students who break school rules. We report only suspensions in which students are sent home for a day or longer. We do not report in-school suspensions, in which students are removed from one or more classes during a single school day. Expulsion is the most serious consequence we can impose. Expelled students are removed from the school permanently and denied the opportunity to continue learning here.

KEY FACTOR	OUR SCHOOL	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
<b>Suspensions per 100 students</b>			
<b>2010–2011</b>	2	3	N/A
<b>2009–2010</b>	1	4	6
<b>2008–2009</b>	1	5	6
<b>Expulsions per 100 students</b>			
<b>2010–2011</b>	0	0	N/A
<b>2009–2010</b>	0	0	0
<b>2008–2009</b>	0	0	0

SOURCE: Data is from the Consolidated Application published by the California Department of Education. The numbers above are a ratio of suspension or expulsion events, per 100 students enrolled. District and state averages represent elementary schools only.

During the 2010–2011 school year, we had ten suspension incidents. We had no incidents of expulsion. To make it easy to compare our suspensions and expulsions to those of other schools, we represent these events as a ratio (incidents per 100 students) in this report. Please note that multiple incidents may involve the same student.

**STUDENT PERFORMANCE**

**California Standardized Testing and Reporting Program**

The California Standards Tests (CST) show how well students are learning what the state content standards require. The CST include English/language arts and mathematics in grades two through five and science in grade five. We also include results from the California Modified Assessment and California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

**STAR Test Results for All Students: Three-Year Comparison**

The percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most current three-year period.

SUBJECT	SCHOOL PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			DISTRICT PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED			STATE PERCENT PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
English/ language arts	84%	86%	85%	63%	66%	68%	49%	52%	54%
Mathematics	86%	87%	86%	60%	63%	64%	46%	48%	50%
Science	89%	88%	94%	65%	68%	72%	50%	54%	57%

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2011 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

**STAR Test Results by Student Subgroup: Most Recent Year**

The percentage of students, by subgroup, achieving at the Proficient or Advanced level (meeting or exceeding the state standards) for the most recent testing period.

STUDENT GROUP	STUDENTS SCORING PROFICIENT OR ADVANCED		
	ENGLISH/ LANGUAGE ARTS 2010–2011	MATHEMATICS 2010–2011	SCIENCE 2010–2011
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	88%	95%	90%
Filipino	92%	92%	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	86%	61%	N/A
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (not Hispanic)	82%	84%	95%
Two or more Races	N/A	N/A	N/A
Boys	82%	86%	92%
Girls	88%	86%	95%
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	80%	82%	0%
English Learners	68%	82%	0%
Students with disabilities	69%	74%	0%
Receives migrant education services	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: STAR results, spring 2011 test cycle, as interpreted and published by the CDE unit responsible for School Accountability Report Cards.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

**California Academic Performance Index (API)**

The Academic Performance Index (API) is an annual measure of the academic performance and progress of schools in California. APIs range from 200 to 1000, with a statewide target of 800. Detailed information about the API can be found on the CDE Web site at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/>.

**API Ranks: Three-Year Comparison**

The state assigns statewide and similar-schools API ranks for all schools. The API ranks range from 1 to 10. A statewide rank of 1 means that the school has an API in the lowest 10 percent of all elementary schools in the state, while a statewide rank of 10 means that the school has an API in the highest 10 percent of all elementary schools in the state. The similar-schools API rank reflects how a school compares with 100 statistically matched schools that have similar teachers and students.

API RANK	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011
Statewide rank	10	10	10
Similar-schools rank	7	6	7

SOURCE: The API Base Report from December 2011.

**API Changes by Subgroup: Three-Year Comparison**

API changes for all students and student subgroups: the actual API changes in points added or lost for the past three years, and the most recent API. Note: "N/A" means that the student group is not numerically significant.

SUBGROUP	ACTUAL API CHANGE			API
	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010–2011	2010–2011
All students at the school	+2	+12	-2	939
Black/African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian or Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	-7	+26	+13	976
Filipino	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	-28	889
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White (non Hispanic)	-4	+4	-7	923
Two or more races	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	+4	896
English Learners	N/A	+31	-8	921
Students with disabilities	N/A	N/A	-59	820

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2011.

### API Scores by Subgroup

This table includes Academic Performance Index results for our school, our district, and the state.

SUBGROUP	SCHOOL		DISTRICT		STATE	
	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	API
All students	411	939	19,281	851	4,683,676	778
Black/African American	3	N/A	255	801	317,856	696
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	N/A	39	817	33,774	733
Asian	140	976	2,427	944	398,869	898
Filipino	10	N/A	1,298	893	123,245	859
Hispanic or Latino	35	889	4,284	778	2,406,749	729
Pacific Islander	0	N/A	20	913	26,953	764
White (non Hispanic)	220	923	10,852	854	1,258,831	845
Two or more races	2	N/A	98	900	76,766	836
Socioeconomically disadvantaged	38	896	8,953	798	2,731,843	726
English Learners	104	921	7,814	771	1,521,844	707
Students with disabilities	42	820	1,862	661	521,815	595

SOURCE: The API Growth Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2011.

### Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Intervention Programs

The federal law known as No Child Left Behind requires that all schools and districts meet all three of the following criteria in order to attain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):

- (a) a 95-percent participation rate on the state’s tests
- (b) a CDE-mandated percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on the state’s English/language arts and mathematics tests
- (c) an API of at least 710 or growth of at least one point
- (d) the graduation rate for the graduating class must be higher than 90 percent (or satisfy alternate improvement criteria).

#### AYP for the District

Whether the district met the federal requirement for AYP overall, and whether the district met each of the AYP criteria.

AYP CRITERIA	DISTRICT
Overall	No
Graduation rate	Yes
Participation rate in English/language arts	Yes
Participation rate in mathematics	Yes
Percent Proficient in English/language arts	No
Percent Proficient in mathematics	No
Met Academic Performance Index (API)	Yes

SOURCE: The AYP Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2011.

#### Intervention Program: District Program Improvement (PI)

Districts receiving federal Title I funding enter Program Improvement (PI) if they do not make AYP for two consecutive years in the same content area (English/language arts or mathematics) and for each grade span or on the same indicator (API or graduation rate). After entering PI, districts advance to the next level of intervention with each additional year that they do not make AYP.

INDICATOR	DISTRICT
PI stage	1 of 3
The year the district entered PI	2011
Number of schools currently in PI	11
Percentage of schools currently in PI	34%

SOURCE: The Program Improvement Report as released in the Accountability Progress Report in December 2011.



**DISTRICT EXPENDITURES**

According to the CDE, "State certification/release dates for fiscal data occur in middle to late spring, precluding the inclusion of 2010–11 data in most cases. Therefore, 2009–10 data are used for report cards prepared during 2011–12."

Total expenses include only the costs related to direct educational services to students. This figure does not include food services, land acquisition, new construction, and other expenditures unrelated to core educational purposes. The expenses-per-student figure is calculated by dividing total expenses by the district's average daily attendance (ADA). More information is available on the [CDE's Web site](#).

CATEGORY OF EXPENSE	OUR DISTRICT	SIMILAR DISTRICTS	ALL DISTRICTS
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2009–2010</b>			
Total expenses	\$212,092,576	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$8,325	\$8,543	\$8,452
<b>FISCAL YEAR 2008–2009</b>			
Total expenses	\$217,571,164	N/A	N/A
Expenses per student	\$8,471	\$8,823	\$8,736

SOURCE: Fiscal Services Division, California Department of Education.

**District Salaries, 2009–2010**

This table reports the salaries of teachers and administrators in our district for the 2009–2010 school year. This table compares our average salaries with those in districts like ours, based on both enrollment and the grade level of our students. In addition, we report the percentage of our district's total budget dedicated to teachers' and administrators' salaries. The costs of health insurance, pensions, and other indirect compensation are not included.

SALARY INFORMATION	DISTRICT AVERAGE	STATE AVERAGE
Beginning teacher's salary	\$42,451	\$42,017
Midrange teacher's salary	\$65,170	\$67,294
Highest-paid teacher's salary	\$88,157	\$86,776
Average principal's salary (elementary school)	\$107,023	\$108,534
Superintendent's salary	\$286,847	\$226,417
Percentage of budget for teachers' salaries	41%	38%
Percentage of budget for administrators' salaries	5%	5%

SOURCE: School Accountability Report Card unit of the California Department of Education.

